

REMARKS

The specification has been amended to clarify that the images that are stored, designated, displayed and otherwise processed, are not '3D' images but rather '2D' images. In accordance with the invention, 2D images are used to simulate the rotation effect of a 3D environment (clearly disclosed in the section of 'field of the invention'). Therefore, no new matter is added by these amendments.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 9, 10, 12, 15 and 16 have been amended to narrow the scope of the present invention as defined in the independent claims 1, 9 and 16 by incorporating the limitations of claims 6 and 9 respectively into claims 1 and 9 and adding similar limitations to claim 16, wherein the limitations of claim 6 are added to claim 1, and the limitations of claim 14 are added to claim 9. The addition of step designation (a to e) is provided only for purposes of identify such steps in the new claims. Claims 6 and 14 are cancelled. New claims 17-22 have been added to further protect the invention. Applicant submits that no new matter is added by these amendments.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Mou* (US #6690395) in view of *Saito* (JP2002-288690). Claims 2, 10, 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Mou* and *Saito*, and further in view of *Karkkainen* (US #6600936). Claims 6 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103 (a) as being unpatentable over *Mou* and *Saito*, and further in view of *Ito* (JP2002-163103A). Applicant has amended claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 9, 10, 12, 15 and 16 to replace "3D images" with "2D images", and the limitations of claim 6 are added to claim 1, and the limitations of claim 14 are added to claim 9. The rejections respectfully are traversed.

Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner's attention to MPEP 2143, which states that

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. (Emphases added by the applicant.)

In regard to claims 1, 9 and 16, it is respectfully submitted that *Mou*, *Saito*, and *Ito* in fact do not teach or suggest the features of the invention for which the examiner relies upon the references. Thus, *Mou*, *Saito*, and *Ito* fail to disclose, suggest, or teach, *inter alia*, the following features recited by above claims:

providing a plurality of 2D images arranged in sequence, the 2D image corresponding to menu options of the mobile phone, wherein ***the 2D images arranged in the sequence compose a 360° scene.*** (emphasis added)

The Examiner states that *Ito* teaches that "the 3D images arranged in the sequence compose a 360° scene." Paragraph [0015] of *Ito* reads, "An arrangement means makes a screen the room structure of five face pieces, and the Personal Digital Assistant concerning this invention sticks two or more menus on the floor, head lining, or the wall of the room." It therefore is clear that ***Ito discloses only that the screen may be a room structure of five face pieces.*** In the present invention, however, 2D images are used to simulate the rotation effect of a 3D environment. That is, in accordance with the invention, ***the 2D images are arranged in sequence, and the 2D images arranged in the sequence compose a 360° scene.*** See, for example, Fig. 3 and new dependent claims 20, 21 and 22. Nowhere does *Ito* teach a room structure composed of a plurality 2D image. Additionally, *Ito* illustrates the screen of room structure comprising five face pieces in Fig. 10 of the reference. It is clear that, ***the five face pieces in Fig. 10 of Ito do not compose a completely 3D environment. Nowhere does Ito disclose the claimed feature, which constitutes a simulation of a 3D environment using a plurality of 2D images.***

Since *Mou*, *Saito*, and *Ito* fail to teach the claimed features of the invention, the applicants believe that claims 1, 9 and 16 are clearly patentable over the cited reference. Insofar as claims 2-5 and 7-8 directly or indirectly depend from claim 1, and claims 10-13 and 15 directly or indirectly depend from claim 9, these claims similarly are believed to be patentable.

New dependent claims 17-22 are directed to features of the invention illustrated in Fig. 3, and further distinguish the invention of the cited references.


In view of the foregoing remarks, the applicant respectfully requests the Examiner's reconsideration of the application and the timely allowance of claims. It therefore is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance and such a Notice, with allowed claims 1-5, 7-13 and 15-22, earnestly is solicited.

Should the Examiner feel that a conference would help to expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to contact the undersigned counsel to arrange for such an interview.

No fee is believed due. Should any fee be required, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the fee to our Deposit Account No. 18-0002, and advise us accordingly.

Respectfully submitted,

December 13, 2007
Date



Steven M. Rabin – Reg. No. 29,102
RABIN & BERDO, PC
Customer No. 23995
Facsimile: 202-408-0924
Telephone: 202-371-8976

SMR:ac